

ON THE CONNECTIVITY WAITER-CLIENT GAME

SYLWIA ANTONIUK, CODRUȚ GROSU, AND LOTHAR NARINS

ABSTRACT. In this short note we consider a variation of the connectivity Waiter-Client game $WC(n, q, \mathcal{A})$ played on an n -vertex graph G which consists of $q+1$ disjoint spanning trees. In this game in each round Waiter offers Client $q+1$ edges of G which have not yet been offered. Client chooses one edge and the remaining q edges are discarded. The aim of Waiter is to force Client to build a connected graph. If this happens Waiter wins. Otherwise Client is the winner. We consider the case where $2 < q+1 < \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ and show that for each such q there exists a graph G for which Client has a winning strategy. This result stands in opposition to the case where G consists of just 2 spanning trees or where G is a complete graph, since it has been shown that for such graphs Waiter can always force Client to build a connected graph.

1. INTRODUCTION

Waiter-Client games were first defined and studied by Beck (see e.g [1]) under the name of Picker-Chooser games. These are positional games closely related to the well-studied Maker-Breaker games and Avoider-Enforcer games. Waiter-Client game $WC(n, q, \mathcal{A})$ is a two player, perfect information game played on the complete graph K_n , which proceeds in rounds. In each round, the first player, called Waiter, offers $q+1$ edges of G which have not yet been offered. The second player, called Client, chooses one edge, and the remaining edges are discarded. The aim of Waiter is to force Client to build a graph that satisfies a given monotone property $\mathcal{A}$. If this happens Waiter wins. Otherwise Client wins.

We consider the following version of Waiter-Client game $WC(n, q, \mathcal{A})$ which we call the connectivity Waiter-Client game. This time the game is played on an n -vertex graph G which is the union of $q+1$ disjoint spanning trees and the aim of Waiter is to force Client to build a connected graph, i.e. $\mathcal{A}$ is the property of being connected.

Csernenszky et al. [3] showed that for $q+1 = 2$ Waiter always has a winning strategy. Bednarska-Bzdega et al. [2] showed that the same is true for G being a complete graph, in which case n is necessarily even. This result follows from the more general Theorem 3.3 in [2] which says that in the Waiter-Client connectivity game $WC(n, q, \mathcal{A})$ played on the

CG and LN were supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft within the research training group ‘Methods for Discrete Structures’ (GRK 1408).

complete graph K_n , Waiter can always force Client to build a graph of size at least $\min\{n, 2(n - q - 1)\}$, provided that n is sufficiently large. In particular, if n is even and $q + 1 = n/2$ then Waiter wins.

In [2], the authors posed a question whether in the connectivity Waiter-Client game $WC(n, q, \mathcal{A})$ played on a graph G which is a disjoint union of $q+1$ spanning trees Waiter always has a winning strategy. We show that the answer to this question is negative.

Theorem 1. *Let $2 < q + 1 < \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$. Then there exists an n -vertex graph G which is a union of $q + 1$ disjoint spanning trees and such that in the connectivity Waiter-Client game $WC(n, q, \mathcal{A})$ played on G , Client has a winning strategy.*

Remark 2. *This leaves open the cases $q + 1 = (n - 1)/2$ for n odd, and $q + 1 = n/2 - 1$ for n even. It may be tempting to believe that in these cases Client wins as well. However, we found that for $n = 7$ and $n = 9$, Waiter has a winning strategy.*

2. THE PROOF

We first fix some notation. Whenever the game is played on a graph G , we proceed in rounds. In each round we delete from G all edges offered by Waiter in this round and we denote by G_i the graph obtained in this way, where i is the number of the round. In particular, $G_0 = G$ and $G_{n-1} = \emptyset$. The edges which have not yet been offered by Waiter are called *free edges*. Moreover, we let H_i denote the graph built on the same vertex set as G and consisting of all the edges chosen by Client up till the i -th round. In particular, $H_0 = \emptyset$ and $H = H_{n-1}$ is the graph built by Client when the game has finished. The Client wins if H_{n-1} is not connected.

We make the following easy observations which hold for all rounds i .

Observation 3. *If in the i -th round, there is a connected component $C \neq H_i$ in H_i that has at most $q + 2$ outgoing edges in G_i , then Waiter has the following options:*

- *he offers only edges not incident to C ;*
- *all the edges he offers are incident to C ;*
- *in case the number of edges incident to C in G_i is exactly $q + 2$, he offers one of them and q other edges not incident to C .*

Indeed, if Waiter offers $2 \leq i < q + 1$ edges incident to C , then Client can refuse all of them. Then at any later moment of time, Waiter can offer at most $q + 2 - i < q + 1$ edges incident to C . Consequently, Client can always refuse all of them, leading to C becoming an isolated component in H_{n-1} .

Observation 4. *If $C \neq H_i$ is a connected component in H_i that has at most q outgoing edges in G_i then Client wins the game.*

Observation 5. *If u and v are isolated in H_i , u and v have degree $q + 1$ in G_i and are adjacent, then Client wins the game.*

Indeed, suppose without loss of generality that Waiter offers all $q + 1$ edges incident to u . Then Client chooses the edge uv . At any later moment of time, Client can discard any offered edge that is incident to v , leading to uv becoming an isolated component in H_{n-1} .

Before we proceed to the proof of Theorem 1, we need the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let K_{3k} be the complete graph on $3k$ vertices, where $k \geq 2$. Then there exist $k + 1$ disjoint spanning trees in K_{3k} .*

It follows from Nash-Williams theorem [4] that K_n has $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ edge-disjoint spanning trees. This in particular proves Lemma 6.

We now show the following.

Lemma 7. *For any $q \geq 2$ there exists a graph $G = G(q)$ with $3(q + 1)$ vertices, which is a disjoint union of $q + 1$ spanning trees and such that Client has a winning strategy on G .*

Note that this proves Theorem 1 in the case $n = 3q + 3$. We will later extend this construction to all q satisfying $2 < q + 1 < \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$.


Proof of Lemma 7. The construction goes as follows.

We divide the vertices of G into three sets $U = \{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_q\}$, $V = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_q\}$ and $W = \{w_0, w_1, \dots, w_q\}$. Next, we construct $q + 1$ spanning trees T_i , $i = 0, \dots, q$. We first put the edges $\{u_0u_1, u_0v_0, v_0w_0\}$ into T_0 , $\{v_0v_1, u_0w_0, w_0w_1\}$ into T_1 , and $\{u_0u_i, v_0v_i, w_0w_i\}$ into T_i , where $i = 2, \dots, q$ (see Figure 1). By Lemma 6, we can find $q + 1$ disjoint spanning trees $T'_0, T'_1, \dots, T'_q$ on the vertices $(U \cup V \cup W) \setminus \{u_0, v_0, w_0\}$. We put the edges of T'_i into T_i , for $i = 0, \dots, q$. Hence, we get $q + 1$ disjoint spanning trees on the vertex set $U \cup V \cup W$. This is our graph $G = G(q)$.

We present a strategy for Client which ensures that he will win the game. Let G' be the subgraph of G consisting of all edges adjacent to at least one of the vertices u_0, v_0 or w_0 (this is precisely the graph in Figure 1). We show that Client can isolate a subgraph of the triangle $u_0v_0w_0$, that is Client can ensure that in H one of the vertices u_0, v_0, w_0 or one of the edges u_0v_0, v_0w_0, w_0u_0 , or the whole triangle $u_0v_0w_0$ is a connected component.

Now notice that the vertices u_0, v_0 and w_0 have degree $q + 2$ in G . Therefore, by Observation 3, the first time Waiter presents an edge incident to any of the above vertices, say to u_0 , he must present either exactly one edge incident to u_0 or $q + 1$ edges incident to that vertex. By symmetry the same argument works for v_0 and w_0 .

Moreover, whenever Waiter presents an edge outside of G' , Client can choose this edge and thus the number of free edges in G' can only

FIGURE 1. The construction of $G(q)$ 

drop down. It is easy to see that if Client has a winning strategy on the graph G' then the same strategy works for the graph G' with some of the edges deleted. Thus we may focus on the game played entirely on the graph G' (and the same parameter q).

We shall assume by symmetry that in the first round one of the edges offered is adjacent to u_0 . We have two subcases.

Case 1: All of the edges offered are incident to u_0 .

Then either Waiter presents both u_0v_0 and u_0w_0 , or just one of them, say u_0v_0 .

In the first case, Client chooses a third edge (not adjacent to v_0 nor w_0) and by Observation 5 he wins the game.

In the second case, Client chooses u_0v_0 . There are only $q + 2$ free edges incident to u_0v_0 now. If in the next round, both edges u_0w_0 and v_0w_0 are offered, then all the other edges offered must be incident to w_0 too. Client chooses one of these edges, leaving only q free edges incident to u_0v_0 , and thus winning the game. If in the second round, exactly one of u_0w_0 and v_0w_0 is offered, then Client chooses this edge. There are only q free edges left incident to the triangle $u_0v_0w_0$, and so again Client wins. So in the second round, by Observation 3, Waiter offers q edges incident to v_0 and 1 edge incident to w_0 . Client then picks the edge incident to w_0 , leaving only $2 \leq q$ free edges incident to u_0v_0 . So Client wins in this last situation as well.

Case 2: Exactly one of the edges offered is incident to u_0 .

We may assume that Case 1 does not apply to v_0 nor w_0 , otherwise we are done. Then by Observation 3, Waiter offers one edge incident to u_0 , one incident to v_0 , and one incident to w_0 . Thus $q = 2$. Furthermore

the edge incident to u_0 is either u_0u_1 or u_0u_2 . Client then chooses this edge.

In the second round Waiter has to offer at least one edge incident to $\{v_0, w_0\}$. Consequently by Observation 3, Waiter must offer three edges adjacent to one of the vertices v_0 or w_0 . Then Client chooses the edge v_0w_0 . There are only 2 edges left incident with v_0w_0 , and so Client wins by Observation 4. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1. The crucial part of the above argument is the existence of a subgraph G' in which we have three vertices spanning a triangle and such that the degree of each of them in G is equal precisely to $q + 2$. By repeating the same reasoning, one can ensure oneself that in the connectivity game played on the graph G of this form, that is having such a subgraph G' , Client always has a winning strategy. In the remaining part of the proof we show that for any $3 \leq q + 1 < \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ there exists such a graph $G = G(n, q)$.

Let $n \geq 9$ and $3 \leq q + 1 < \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$. We use the induction to construct $G(n, q)$ from $G(n - 2, q - 1)$. To start the induction, we need a graph $G(n - 2(q - 2), 2)$ on $n - 2(q - 2) \geq 9$ vertices, which is the union of three spanning trees and which has three fixed vertices u_0, v_0, w_0 each of degree four and such that they span a triangle. For example, we can take the graph $G(2)$ which has 9 vertices, add to it $n - 2(q - 2) - 9$ new vertices and add three edges between each new vertex and three arbitrary vertices from $G(2)$ different from u_0, v_0, w_0 .

The construction goes as follows. Assume that we have already constructed the graph $G(n_0, q_0)$ on n_0 vertices which is the union of $q_0 + 1$ spanning trees and in which u_0, v_0, w_0 all have degree $q_0 + 2$. We now split vertices of $G(n_0, q_0)$ into three sets V_1, V_2 and V_3 . The set V_1 consists of the vertices u_0, v_0, w_0 , and we split the remaining vertices into two sets of size $\lfloor \frac{n_0-3}{2} \rfloor$ and $\lceil \frac{n_0-3}{2} \rceil$ respectively. Let $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_{q_0}$ denote the spanning trees of $G(n_0, q_0)$. We add two new vertices u and v . We then use the edges between u and V_2 to extend each spanning tree T_i to a spanning tree T'_i of $G(n_0, q_0) \cup \{u\}$. Note that this is possible, as $\lfloor \frac{n_0-3}{2} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n_0-1}{2} \rfloor - 1 \geq q_0 + 1$. Similarly, we use the edges between v and V_3 to extend each T'_i to a spanning tree of $G(n_0, q_0) \cup \{u, v\}$. Finally, we construct a new spanning tree T of $G(n_0, q_0) \cup \{u, v\}$ from the edges uv, uu_0, uv_0, uvw_0 and all edges between u and V_3 and all edges between v and V_2 . $\square$

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Tibor Szabó for bringing the problem studied in this paper to our attention.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Beck, *Positional games and the second moment method*, Combinatorica 22 (2002), 169–216.

- [2] M. Bednarska-Bzdega, D. Hefetz, M. Krivelevich, T. Łuczak, *Manipulative waiters with probabilistic intuition*, preprint.
- [3] A. Csernenszky, C. I. Mándity, A. Pluhár, *On Chooser-Picker positional games*, Discrete Mathematics 309 (2009), 5141–5146.
- [4] C.S.J.A. Nash-Williams, *Edge-Disjoint Spanning Trees of Finite Graphs*, J. London Math. Soc. (1961) s1-36 (1): 445-450.

ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE (on leave), UL. UMULTOWSKA 87, 61-614 POZNAŃ, POLAND

INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK, UL. ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-656 WARSZAWA, POLAND

E-mail address: antoniuk@amu.edu.pl

FREIE UNIVERSITÄT, BERLIN, GERMANY

E-mail address: grosu.codrut@gmail.com

E-mail address: narins@math.fu-berlin.de